

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
ADRIA ENGLISH,

Plaintiff,

-against-

SEAN COMBS also known as P. DIDDY, DIDDY,
PUFF, PUFF DADDY, PUFFY, BROTHER LOVE (an
Individual); BAD BOY ENTERTAINMENT
HOLDINGS, INC. (a corporation); SEAN JOHN
CLOTHING LLC, INC. (a corporation), COMBS
GLOBAL ENTERPRISES (a corporation), JOHN AND
JANE DOES 1-10, and ORGANIZATIONAL DOES
1-10, Inclusive,

Defendants.

ANALISA TORRES, District Judge:

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 3/11/2025

24 Civ. 5090 (AT)

ORDER

This order concerns, but does not resolve, the motions at ECF Nos. 64, 66–67.

The Court is in receipt of counsel for Plaintiff’s motion to withdraw as counsel. ECF No. 64; Mem., ECF No. 65. Counsel’s memorandum of law is conclusory and contains factual assertions unsupported by the declarations filed in conjunction with the motion. *See, e.g.*, Mem. at 2, 3, 4, and 5. Counsel’s declarations and the memorandum of law are also ambiguous as to whether Plaintiff consents to the motion to withdraw. *See id.* at 2; ECF No. 64-2 ¶ 7.

Accordingly, by **March 18, 2025**, counsel for Plaintiff and Plaintiff shall confer to determine whether they have a mutual understanding as to the appropriate next steps. By that same date, counsel shall email the Court a declaration or declarations setting forth the outcome of the conferral for *in camera* review. *See Weinberger v. Provident Life & Cas. Ins. Co.*, No. 97 Civ. 9262, 1998 WL 898309, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 23, 1998) (“[I]t is appropriate for a Court considering a counsel’s motion to withdraw to consider *in camera* submissions to prevent a party from being prejudiced by the application of counsel to withdraw.” (italics added)). If counsel continues to seek leave to withdraw, the declarations shall describe in detail the breakdown in communication, including a timeline of the breakdown and the steps, if any, counsel has taken to repair the relationship.

The Court has considered the parties’ filings at ECF Nos. 66 and 67. All hearings and deadlines in this matter, including Plaintiff’s deadline to respond to Defendants’ pre-motion letter at ECF No. 67, are STAYED pending further order of the Court.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 11, 2025
New York, New York



ANALISA TORRES
United States District Judge